

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Ganzenmüller's *Ciris. Beiträge zur Ciris* DR. von Carl Ganzenmüller. Leipzig. 1894.

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 08 / October 1894, pp 352 - 353

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188638, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188638

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 352-353 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188638

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

GANZENMÜLLER'S *CIRIS*.

Beiträge zur Ciris von Dr. CARL GANZENMÜLLER. Leipzig. 1894.

Dr. GANZENMÜLLER in this excellent dissertation on the *Ciris* (which forms part of the twentieth supplemental volume to Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*), has reopened the questions which the problematical character of the poem raises, and which he satisfactorily shows to be hitherto unsolved. Teuffel had fixed the date of its composition from 19-14 B.C. Dr. Ganzenmüller finds in it too many parallelisms with Ovid to admit so early a date. Zingerle in his *Kleine philologischen Abhandlungen* iii. pp. 23-31 (Innsbruck 1892) had already called attention to these correspondences between the two poets, but had not pressed the inquiry. The present treatise is minute and detailed, filling more than 100 pages of close small print. It must form the basis of any future edition, commentary or dissertation on the poem.

Unlike the *Culex*, *Moretum*, *Dirae*, *Copa*, the *Ciris* is preserved in no good or early MS. One short fragment alone 454-541 is contained in a Brussels codex of the twelfth century: all the other MSS. are, so far as is yet known, of the fifteenth. It was my hope, when working in Rome in 1887, to have discovered a new and independent source for the text of the *Ciris*, as the Corsini is for the text of the *Culex*, but in this I was disappointed, though some vestiges of a better tradition are mentioned in my article 'Further Notes on the *Ciris* and other poems of the Appendix Vergiliana' published in vol. viii. of the *American Journal of Philology*. After all, the text of the *Ciris* is less desperate than the *Catalepta*, a collection preserved in very few MSS., and those so hopelessly corrupt as to baffle all the ingenuity of criticism.

The first part of Ganzenmüller's dissertation is a comparison of the verses of the *Ciris* with those of other poets, mainly of the Ciceronian and Augustan eras, though those of a later time are sometimes cited also, e.g. Manilius, Lucan, Val. Flaccus, Statius.

Catullus and Vergil are the poets most largely borrowed from: but there are many parallels with Lucretius, and, as Ganzenmüller successfully shows, with Ovid, though in reading them side by side it is difficult to feel any certainty which of the two poets

preceded the other. G. believes that the *Astronomica* of Manilius were read and used by the poet of the *Ciris* (p. 561, note). The combination *Felix illa dies* in both is at least noticeable: but it is not certain that *illa* was written by the author of the *Ciris*, some of the MSS. giving *ille*.

The juxtaposition of so large a collection of passages where the same combinations of words in the same place of the verse occur is very instructive, even if it leaves the reader in doubt as to such combinations being anything more than fortuitous. V. 122 of the *Ciris* ends with the words *vertice crinis*; G. cites the same ending (sometimes with *crinem* or *crines*) ten times from Catullus, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius, Lucan, Silius and Statius. It is obvious that little or nothing can be inferred from so large an array of coincident endings as to any one of the poets being indebted to the other. *Perhaps*, and this is all we can say, Catullus set the tone, and it was taken up more or less unconsciously by the poets who followed him. Again *Cir.* 170 ends with the words *bacata monilia collo*, and the same combination, only with the participle altered, is cited four times from Ovid. But it is at least as possible that Ovid took the combination from the *Ciris*, as *vice versa*. What is certain is that the poet of the *Ciris* copied, not Ovid, but Vergil, *Aen.* i. 654 *colloque monile Bacatum*. So, if both the *Ciris* and the account of Scylla in *Metamm.* viii. have *Nise pater!* as an exclamation, it is more than probable that one borrowed from the other: but I am not prepared to say with Ganzenmüller that Ovid was the prior of the two.

Let me put the point in another form. The active use of *requiescere* is found in Calvus, the *Eclogues* of Vergil, and the *Ciris*. In all these cases the accusative is *cursus*. Here it is likely that Vergil copied Calvus, certain that he was himself copied by the poet of the *Ciris*. No such use is found in Ovid. What is to be inferred? I should suppose that the construction was felt by Ovid to be too harsh and strange to be admissible: the language of poetry had become more sensitive and intolerant of abnormal uses. If it was so, the *Ciris* would seem to belong to the less exacting and earlier period, and such real parallelisms with it as are found in Ovid are imitations of the *Ciris*.

The same reasoning may be applied to another of G.'s arguments. The *Ciris* omits those parts of the Scylla-legend which Ovid dwells upon, because they were familiar already as Ovid had presented them in *Metamm.* viii. It is equally possible that Ovid, having the *Ciris* before him, enlarged on those parts which he did not find there.

The general view of G. may be thus stated. The first sketch of the *Ciris* was made shortly after the publication of the *Georgics* (four lines of which (i. 406-409) form the argument of the poem and are repeated in it word for word *Cir.* 538-541), i.e. in 30-29 B.C. Its author, at the time quite young and under the influence of Catullus and the imitators of the Alexandrian school, was diverted from his project and only resumed it in later life, perhaps when sixty years of age. What it may have lost in youthful fire, it has gained in finish and apt imitation of other and later poets, particularly Ovid. In form however it still retains the Alexandrian outline on which Catullus and Calvus constructed their epyllia, the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis, and the Io: with an additional tendency to Lucretian reminiscences, natural to an author who had purposed, as he tells us (5 *sqq.*), a more ambitious poem of a philosophical or scientific, probably astronomical, character. His training shows itself pre-eminently Greek: he seems indeed to have fixed his residence in Athens, and to this are probably owing not only his frequent allusions to recognized Athenian customs and observances, e.g. the *navis Panathenaica* and *peplum* embroidered with the battle of the Giants, the *τρίρυγες* used to fasten the hair (Thuc. i. 6), but the minute description of the coast-scenery in the neighbourhood, and the details about the founding or building of Megara. Hence also the number of Greek words, which G. estimates as 146 in a total of 1360, an average exceeding Catullus,

many of them not proper names, *psalterium*, *storax*, *thallus*, *sophia*, *haliaetos*, *oestrus*. In estimating the merits of the poem, G. is inclined to side rather with the depreciatory side. It is, as has often been observed, in an extraordinary manner a cento: the vast array of parallels now collected does not seem to me to add much to this at once obtrusive and palpable note of inferiority. It abounds, too, in parentheses and repetitions, sometimes, no doubt, purposely introduced to give a rhetorical effect, more often from imperfect command of poetical technic. G.'s lists here are curious and very interesting in comparison with Catullus' sixty-fourth poem, which is open to the same criticism. My own inclination is to rank the *Ciris* higher than G. would admit: especially the speeches of the Nurse are well conceived and the suggestion of Scylla's real object in her mysterious visit to Nisus' bed-chamber is conveyed in language which recalls Ovid without his indecency. It is a pity that we cannot compare here Cinna's *Smyrna* with the *Ciris*: but from Martial's epigram it seems to have been doomed early to extinction; yet we may feel certain from Catullus' high-flown eulogy, as well as from the fine fragments which have survived, that Cinna had poured all the resources of a lavish art into his portrayal of Myrrha's incestuous passion.

Much is to be learnt from the metrical details which form another section of Ganzemüller's dissertation. I cannot but agree with him in his disparagement of Drobisch's and Lederer's statistics; in contrast with these mechanical appraisers of poetry, all that G. has put together as to the characteristics of the *Ciris*, looked at as a new experiment in hexameter, is sound, judicious, and convincing. There are however points on which he is silent, and to which I hope again to return.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

SCHLEE'S SCHOLIA TERENTIANA.

Scholia Terentiana. Collegit et disposuit
FRID. SCHLEE. Leipzig: 1893. Teubner.
184 pp.

THIS is an attempt to place within convenient reach of Terentian scholars all that are valuable of the scholia existing in manuscripts other than the Bembine; and to

establish the antiquity and importance of these scholia, in opposition to the adverse judgment of Umpfenbach in *Hermes* ii. 338—a judgment that now for the first time is shown to have had little foundation in fact. Indeed, since the year 1867, when Umpfenbach edited the Bembine scholia in the journal already named, the scholia of the